UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,470	09/27/2006	Joel Zychick	1047-031	1309
34060 MICHAEL N. I	7590 05/20/201 HAYNES		EXAMINER	
1341 HUNTER	SFIELD CLOSE		SASTRI, SATYA B	
KESWICK, VA 22947			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/20/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/594,470	ZYCHICK ET AL.
Examiner initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	SATYA B. SASTRI	1796
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>SATYA B. SASTRI</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Mr. Michael Haynes</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 18 May 2010	Time: <u>1.15pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applica Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1, 18, 23		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Satya B Sastri/ Examiner, Art Unit 1796 (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's attorney was contacted to discuss the amendment dated 5/11/10. It was noted that claim 21 indicated as being allowable in the previous office action depended on claim 18. However, the present amendment raises 112 issues in that there is no support for including a soybean protein composition in the polymer composition as recited in claims 1 and 18. Additionally, the wt. percent recited for the multifunctional monomer and the processing aid, with the polyethoxy monomer contributing up to the balance of the dry polymer composition, does not take into account the soybean protein composition present therein (in amended claims 1 and 18). Possible amendment of claim 18, changing the dependency of claims 2-17 to depend on claim 18 and amendment of method claim 23 to include the limitations of claim 18 were discussed. Applicant's attorney was given a reasonable amount of time (24h) to consult with the client.